

Appl. No. 10/523,317
Response to Office Action mailed June 19, 2006

Atty Dkt. No. 114216-019

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 19 2006

REMARKS

The non-final Office Action was issued on pending claims 1-10. Claims 1-10 were rejected. In this Response, claims 1, 3-5 and 7-10 have been amended, claim 2 has been cancelled and no claims have been added. Thus, claims 1 and 3-10 are pending in the application.

Applicants invite the Examiner to call Applicants' Representative to discuss any issues with this application.

Allowable Claims

In the Office Action at page 3, claims 2-5 were noted as being allowable if rewritten to overcome the §112, second paragraph, rejections and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants thank the Examiner for the notice of allowable claims.

Claim 1 has been amended to include allowable claim 2 and some features of allowable claim 5. Claim 2 has been cancelled, and claim 5 has been amended to be consistent with amended claim 1. Claims 3-5 and 7-10 have been amended so as not to depend from cancelled claim 2.

Applicants submit amended claim 1 is allowable. Dependent claims 3-10 are also allowable at least for the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §112

In the Office Action at page 2, claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Office Action refers to the text “therein, is the” in claim 1, line 11 as being incomplete and unclear.

Appl. No. 10/523,317
Response to Office Action mailed June 19, 2006

Atty Dkt. No. 114216-019

In response, claim 1 has been amended to clarify the claim. The text “therein, is the” has been changed to “therein, the.”

Thus, Applicants submit the §112, second paragraph, rejections have been overcome.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §102, §103

In the Office Action at page 2, claims 1 and 7-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Candotti (US 5,575,043). In the Office Action at page 3, claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Candotti. Applicants respectfully disagree.

As mentioned above, claim 1 has been amended to include allowable claim 2 and features of allowable claim 5. Accordingly, amended claim 1 calls for “the crimping parts are a plurality of convex parts formed at prespecified positions with a prespecified space therebetween along the inner periphery of the opening or, when the opening has a polygonal shape, respective sides of the polygonal shape.”

Turning to Candotti, Candotti is discussed in the Background Art section of the specification of the present application. As discussed in Applicants’ specification, the outer circumference of the shaft accommodation member of Candotti only contacts the inner periphery of the button outer shell when the fixture is inserted. See Applicants’ specification at pages 2 and 3, particularly, page 2, lines 6-11. The button covering member may undesirably rotate relative to the accommodation member. The Candotti reference does not show, describe or suggest that the accommodation member and the outer shell are crimped together by the crimping parts being a plurality of convex parts formed at prespecified positions with a prespecified space therebetween along the inner periphery of the opening or, when the opening has a polygonal shape, respective sides of the polygonal shape. Such features are claimed in Applicants’ claim 1. Applicants’ crimping parts can provide for the accommodation member and the outer shell to be mutually firmly engaged by being crimped together.

Appl. No. 10/523,317
Response to Office Action mailed June 19, 2006

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

Atty Dkt. No. 114216-019

SEP 19 2006

Therefore, amended claim 1 is allowable. Dependent claims 3-10 are also allowable at least for the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable.

Thus, Applicants submit that the §102 and §103 rejections should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the patent application is in condition for allowance and request a Notice of Allowance be issued.

Respectfully submitted,

EVEREST INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP

Date: September 19, 2006

BY



Michael S. Leonard, Reg. No. 37,557
P.O. Box 708
Northbrook, IL 60065
Phone: (847) 272-3400